INDEX

of

EXHIBITS

Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description	For In Ident.Evidence
1578	2735		Affidavit of USHIBA, Tomohiko	24286
1580	2735-	A	"On the Tri-Partite Alliance" by Fumimaro KONOYE	24289
206 - G	2736		Excerpts from "Ten Years in Japan" by Joseph C. Grew (pp. 288-294 incl.)	24311
, as		MO	RNING RECESS	24311
1635	2737		Telegram from Ott to the German Foreign Office dated 20 October 1939	24326
1400-E-3	2738		Excerpt from "Foreign Relations of the U.S., Japan, 1931- 1941" a telegram from Ambassador Grew to Cordell Hull dated 23 October 1939	24327
1400-B-3	2739		Excerpt from "Foreign Relations of the U.S., Japan 1931- 1941" Vol. II, De- partment of State, Washington, (pp. 171-173 incl.)	24335

INDEX

0**f**

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Pescription Ident.	In Evidence
			NOON RECESS	24341
837	2740		Address by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA at the Governors' Conference 7 October 1940	24357
1072	2741		Premier KONOYE's Address at the 76th Session of the Imperial Diet 21 January 1941	24370
			AFTERNOON RECESS	24373
312	2742		Address of the Foreign Minister, Admiral Teijiro TOYOSA, at the luncheon in Com- memoration of the First Anniversary of the Con- clusion of the Three- Power Pact 27 September 1941	24374
311	2743		Address of the Foreign Minister Mr. Shigenori TOGO deliver- ed at the Extraordinary Session of the Diet 17 November 1941	24375
1675	2744		Affidavit of Henrich Stahmer	24392

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense: Witnesses	Page
USHIBA, Tomohiko	24280
Direct by Mr. Cunningham	24280
(Witness excused)	24309
Stahmer, Heinrich	24382
Direct Mr. Cunningham	24382

Friday, 13 June 1947

2

3

.

5

,

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE E. H. NORTHCROFT, Member from the Dominion of New Zealand, not sitting from 0930 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Spratt & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.
THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): Mr. President, if the Tribunal please, we present the following language correction: Exhibit No. 849, record page 8414, line 25, substitute "seven or eight fold," for "seventy percent to eighty percent."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I next call witness USHIBA, Tomohiko, former secretary to the late Prince KONOYE -- USHIBA's affidavit, No. 1578.

TOMOHIKO USHIBA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

BY MR. CUNNINGHAM:

Q Mr. USHIBA, will you state your name and your address, please?

A My name is USHIBA, Tomohiko. My address: No. 79 Iriuda, City of Odawara.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I ask that the witness be shown defense document 1578.

n I ask you to look at this document and state whether or not it is your affidavit.

A This is my affidavit.

Q I ask you to state whether or not the statements contained therein are true.

A True and correct.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I offer in evidence defense document 1578 and I offer to read the same into the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to this affidavit in part at this time. The witness was private secretary to the late Prince KONOYE and the object of this affidavit is for him to authenticate two documents to be tendered by the defense. Pages 2, 3 and part of 4 of the affidavit deal with the document 1579, defense number, which has not been served, and we object to the witness referring to that document until it has been served. There are several versions of the document in question known to be in existence and considerable doubt as to their authenticity.

The second document to which the affidavit refers is defense document No. 1580. Presecution objects to that document in toto and, in particular,

objects to the third sentence on page 5 in which the witness purports to state the motive in the late Prince KONOYE's mind in writing this document. The document, he says in the last paragraph on page 4, was compiled about May or June, 1945; and in the paragraph to which I have referred the witness describes the motive as being a desire on the part of the Prince to argue against an opinion which was at that date, according to the witness, prevailing among the people.

In our submission a document written in
May or June 1945 purporting to explain what happened
at the time of, or the reasons for entering into,
the Tri-Partite Pact in 1940 should not be admitted.
A perusal of the document supports the witness'
description of it as an argument although in our
submission the date also indicates that the Prince
must have been well aware of the approaching conclusion
of the war and was preparing his argument for Allied
consumption as a defense. We submit that such a
document is altogether outside the range of contemporary documents written by deceased persons and is
a mere self-serving argument compiled long after the
event.

To sum up, therefore, we object to the first

part of the affidavit's being read until the document referred to has been served.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you submitting, in effect, that this defense document 1579 is in effect or should be an exhibit or an annexure to this affidavit now tendered and should be served with the affidavit?

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: The rule covers not only the document itself, the main document, but such things as annexures and exhibits which are really part of it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we understand your point, Mr. Carr, on that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Yes. With regard to the second part of the affidavit where we have had the document served, we object to that and the document altogether for the reasons which I have given.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: On the first point, your Honors, defense document 1579 which is to be tendered to this witness is not ready for distribution on account of translation. I therefore tender at this stage only defense document 1580 which is Prince KONOYE's memoir on the Tri-Partite Pact, and I specifically intended to eliminate that last page of the

2

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

memoir which was objected to on account of the few words in it which were objectionable and I didn't propose to read that last part of the memoir.

THE PRESIDENT: I am not clear now what you are doing, Mr. Cunningham. Are you withdrawing this affidavit and offering defense document 1580?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: You could take it, your Honor, that I am offering only such part of the affidavit as relates then to 1580 and this witness will be called later and this other document will have to be tendered then. He will be a witness in the later phase of the case anyway.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection goes to this part of the affidavit as well so to determine it we must see defense document 1580.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, in regard to 1580, to meet the objection of the prosecution as relates to 1580, the time when it was written, we must appreciate that at the time the Tri-Partite Pact was signed there was no question about its interpretation and all of the responsible people for the Tri-Partite Pact are dead -- KONOYE, MATSUOKA, SUGI-YAMA -- and we must rely upon these documents for their points of view.

What I meant to say formerly was that the

1 2

question of interpretation of the document, of the Tri-Partite Pact, did not come up in 1940, did not arise until many years later.

THE PRESIDENT: This is the statement of the Prime Minister of the day as to the purposes of the Pact from the Japanese view point, is that so?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: This document is offered for the purpose of showing the Japanese considerations, the purposes of the Pact from the Japanese view point.

Kapleau & Wolf

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

THE PRESIDENT: He was Prime Minister at the time of the execution of the Pact; was he, Mr. Cunningham?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Prince KONOYE was the Prime Minister at the time of the execution of the Pact; yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal admits the document and overrules the objection.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1578 will receive exhibit No. 2735.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2735 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer to read the exhibit, 2735.

"Sworn Deposition (Translation)

"Deponent; -- UsHIBA, Tomohiko

"Having first duly sworn an oath as on attached sheet and in accordance with the procedure followed in my country I hereby depose as follows:

"My present address is No. 79 Iriuda, in the City of Odawara.

"In 1934 (showa 9), when Prince KONOYE travelled to the United States, I accompanied him as his private secretary. During the term of the

17

19

21

23

First KONOYE Cabinet, between 1937 (Showa 12) and 1939 (Showa 14), and of the Second and the Third KONOYE Cabinets, between 1940 (Showa 15) and 1941 (Showa 16), I served the Prince as Private Secretary to the Prime Minister. Even after the resignation of the Third KONOYE Cabinet in October, 1941 (Showa 16) I continued to serve him as private personal secretary.

"Now I will explain the formation and character of Prince KONOYE's Memoirs relating to the negotiations between Japan and America."

I am going to stop at the last.

THE PRESIDENT: You go to page 5 now.

HR. CUNNINGHAM: I am going to leave out reference to 1579.

On page 4:

"Now I will discuss the writing of Prince KONOYE's article entitled 'Concerning the Tri-Partite Alliance'.

"In the year of the cessation the hostilities, that is, towards May or June of 1945 (Showa 20)
Prince KONOYE showed what he himself had written about the above subject to Mr. ITO, Nobufumi, and a few other persons, as well as to myself, and asked for comments upon it. Then, adding some of these

1 2

comments to his text, he had it typewritten on Japanese paper. Furthermore a good number of copies were mimeographed for distribution among his friends.

"Defense document No. 1580 (Japanese text, consisting of 13 sheets) is a copy of the above typewritten one, which was kept by the KONOYE family. The motive upon which this was written is as follows:

"At that time there was an opinion among the people that the war against the United States and Great Britain" --

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham, we do not want his opinions. We just want his verification of the document. All we want him to state in effect is that this is a document written by Prince KONOYE.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I will skip that paragraph then and go to the next paragraph, beginning with:

"After Prince KONOYE died, copies of the mimeographed one were seized and taken away from his residence by the International Prosecution Authorities, just as the copies of KONOYE's Memoir were, That which appeared in a series in the Asahi Newspaper and that which was issued by Nippon

Denpo-Tsushin-Sha were reproductions of the mimeographed one, copies of which were distributed among his friends by Prince KONOYE.

"On this 15th day of April, 1947.

"At International Military Tribunal For the Far East.

"/S/ USHIBA."

Now I offer to read defense document 1580, with the exception of that part of the last part which was objected to and which we agreed not to read.

I ask that defense document 1580 be given an exhibit number.

THE PRESIDENT: If it is part of 2376, it should be an annexia or an exhibit. It should bear the same number plus a letter. It will be 2375-A I understand.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1580 will receive exhibit No. 2735-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2735-A and received in evidence.)

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, for the correctness of the record, I would like to point out that my objection was to the whole of this document

3

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and not only to the last page as my friend says.

THE PRESIDENT: I already said your objection is to the whole and that stands.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer to read exhibit 2735-A with the exception of the last page.

"The idea of a military alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy was proposed by Germany in the summer of 1938, conveyed by Major-General OSHIMA, then Japanese Military Attache in Berlin, and submitted for consideration to the Japanese Cabinet of which I was Prime Minister for the first time. It was a plan to convert the Tri-Partite Anti-Comintern Pact which was in force at that time into a military alliance, the principal target being the, U.S.S.R. The matter was handed down to Baron HIRANUMA's Cabinet when it succeeded mine in January 1939. Deliberations were given the matter by the five Ministers Conference of the HIRANUMA Cabinet which met in as many as seventy odd sessions for that purpose. But, in August of that year, before they were able to come to a conclusion, Germany, without previously communicating it to the Japanese Government suddenly announced the conclusion of a non-aggression pact with Soviet Russia against whom the proposed alliance was to be directed.

wholly unexpected turn of events, which the greatly embarrassed HIRANUMA Cabinet described as 'intricate and baffling', (words now famous in this country) immediately brought to an end the life of the cabinet itself as well as the whole scheme of an alliance against Russia.

"In the spring of 1940, however, when the overwhelming military strength of Germany had swept across western Europe and threatened, as it appeared, the existence of Great Britain, the question of a Tri-Partite military alliance again became a nationwide topic of great popularity. However, inasmuch as the alliance this time was to be directed against Great Britain and the United States and not against the U.S.S.R. as in the previous year, there was a fundamental difference in nature between the two plans. When I was honored with an Imperial Command to form a cabinet for the second time, anti-Anglo-Saxon sentiments and enthusiasm for a Tri-Partite Alliance were at their height, especially among the military circles and some groups of the people among the nation.

"The Tri-Partite Alliance was formally concluded on 27 September 1940. Minister Stahmer had been sent to Japan by the German Government

2

1

4

6

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

as the personal representative of Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, and on 9th and 10th September he held discussions with our Foreign Minister Mr.

MATFUOKA. Since the record of those conversations throws much light upon the specific objectives of the alliance as well as the circumstances in which it was agreed upon, an excerpt of it is given as follows:

"1. Germany does not want the present conflict to develop into a world war, and she wishes to bring it to termination as quickly as possible. She particularly wants the United States to stay out.

"2. Germany does not look for Japan's military assistance at this juncture in connection with her war with England.

"3. What she wants of Japan is to play the role of restraining and preventing the United States from entering the war, by all means. Although Germany does not think at present that the United States will enter the war, she cannot take a chance.

"4. It is, so Germany believes, to the mutual advantage of both Japan and Germany to enter into an understanding or agreement, whereby they will be thoroughly prepared effectively to meet an emergency, at any moment. This only can prevent, if

21

anything can prevent, America from entering the 2 present war, or entering into an armed conflict 3 with Japan in the future.

"5. A strong and determined attitude, 5 unequivocal and unmistakable, on the part of the 6 three nations, Japan, Germany, and Italy, and the knowledge of it by the United States and the world 8 at large at this juncture. That alone can be of 9 a powerful and effective deterrent on the United 10 States. A weak, lukewarm attitude or declaration at this juncture will only invite danger.

"6. Germany hopes that Japan will also 13 estimate the importance of the situation, realize 14 the magnitude and the reality of the potential 15 (perhaps impending for all we may know) danger coming 16 from the Western Hemisphere, and act quickly and 17 decisively to forestall it by reaching an agreement 18 among the three of such a nature that neither the 19 United States nor the rest of the world would be 20 left in doubt.

"7. It is better first to reach an agree-22 ment among Germany, Italy, and Japan and then, 23 immediately to approach Soviet Russia, Germany is 24 prepared to act the part of an honest go-between 25 on the question of rapprochement between Japan and

DIRECT

Soviet Russia, and she can see no unsurmountable obstacles in the path; it may be settled without much difficulty. German-Russia Relations are good, contrary to what the British propaganda claims and Russia is carrying out all her commitments to the full satisfaction of Germany.

Japan) must be thoroughly prepared to meet the worst emergency, Germany will, on the other hand, make use of every means in her power to prevent a clash between the United States and Japan, and even to improve relations between the two, if it is humanly possible.

"9. Stahmer's words may be regarded as coming directly from Ribbentrop.

"As is clear from the above record of the conversations, there were two specific objectives in concluding the Tri-Partite Pact. The first was to prevent the United States from participating in the war in Europe and thus to forestall the spreading of the war; the second, to secure friendly relations between Japan and the U.S.S.R.

23

22

20

16

24

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"1. Prevention of the American Participation in the War

"H. M. the Emperor proclaimed in the Imperial Rescript issued in the occasion of the conclusion of the Treaty, 'Te earnestly desire that war be terminated and peace restored as quickly as possible.' At that time he had in mind the prevention of a world-wide spread of the war, and especially, the prevention of American participation in it. With reference, however, to whether the Tripartite Alliance would serve that purpose, opinion was sharply divided. At the Imperial Conference immediately preceding the conclusion of the proposed Alliance, a member argued that the United States had hitherto been refraining from bringing pressure upon Japan, lest such an action impel Japan to go over to the Axis side, but any decisive move on our part to draw closer to Germany and Italy, so far from functioning as a warning to America, would greatly stiffen her attitude towards us, inasmuch as she was a proud nation; he concluded that the proposed Alliance would only render the adjustment of our relations with the United States so much more difficult that a situation would finally arise in which a war between the two countries would become unavoidable. Mr. MATSUOKA, however, contended as follows:

any attempt to improve friendly relations with the United States by our taking a courteous attitude or of sowing their good-will would not only prove utterly ineffective, but rather precipitate the present estrangement by inviting the feeling of contempt in the United States. If there is any means by which to check the deterioration of relations, and if possible, to improve them at all, that will be to assume what Winister Stahmer called a "determined attitude."

May I ask Mr. Blewett to continue the reading of this? My throat is raw.

MR. BLEWETT (reading continued): "For that purpose, it will be of the utmost importance to make as many allies as possible, and to proclaim it before the world as soon as possible, thus strengthening our position against the United States. Thile keeping ever vigilant eyes upon any repercussions which may arise of such a move on our part, I will try at the same time not to overlook any opportunity of restoring our relations with America to a more normal basis. The important point is, first of all, to show unmistakably a firm stand against the United States.'

"Thich of these opposing views was right, or whether the conclusion of the Tripartite Alliance

was effective in preventing the American participation in the war, must remain a question never answered; for in December 1941, before the United States joined the war, Japan herself, who had wanted that country to stay out, declared war upon her. One might attribute to the existence of the Tripartite Alliance the fact that, for over one year after the proclamation of it. America did not enter the war. One thing at least is beyond doubt; that is, she persistently sought to rob the Alliance of its practical significance throughout the Japanese-American conversations opened in April 1941. I see in that fact clear evidence that the Tripartite Alliance was proved to be from the American point of view, a considerable obstacle to joining the war which could not easily be overcome.

"2. <u>Fstablishment of Friendly Relations with</u> the U.S.S.R.

"The second specific objective of the Tripartite Alliance was to adjust our relations with
Soviet Russia through the mediation of Germany, who
had succeeded in establishing friendly relations with
that country with the conclusion of the Non-Aggression
Pact, and, if possible, to bring about an alliance of
all three by which Japan would be able to make her
voice weightier against the Anglo-American combina-

USHIBA

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

tion and thus facilitate the settlement of the Sino-Japanese conflict.

"For years I had keenly supported the opinion that peaceful relations between Japan and America should be consolidated. It was out of my sincere desire to make a contribution, however meagre, to the peace of the Pacific by discovering a solid basis of mutual understanding between the two peoples that, in the summer of 1934, I had a visit in the United States and met several prominent people in and out of the Government. But since then, against my wishes, Japanese - American relations had deteriorated. Especially, after the outbreak of the conflict in China, they had practically gone into an impasse. After things had taken such a turn there was scarcely any hope of success, as Mr. MATSUOKA pointed out, in the attempt to improve our relations by merely exchanging courtesy and begging for good-will. The Japanese Government had not, of course, always limited itself to such sowing of good-will. On the contrary, the successive Foreign Ministers, notably Mr. ARITA and Admiral NOITIRA, made it their principal aim in diplomacy to reach an understanding with the American Government on the greatest issue of all which lay between the two countries, namely, the China problem,

24

and their efforts to that end were truly painstaking. However, all such efforts having been proved entirely fruitless, it had now become clear that every normal approach to the American Government had been closed. Besides, the danger of Japan being left isolated looked imminent. Under such circumstances, the only possible way left open to Japan was to take sides with the side opposing America, namely, Germany and Italy, and through them, together with the U.S.S.R. as well, to force America to give up the idea of coercing Japan. It was not enough to combine with Germany and Italy. 12 Only when the U.S.S.R. had been induced to join the combination would an equilibrium of power be attained as against the Anglo-American combination, and only when such an equilibrium had been attained would 16 rapproachement with America become possible. The 17 ultimate aim, then, of our attempt to combine with Germany and Russia lay also in the adjustment of our 19 relations with America, and, as the result of such 20 adjustment, the settlement of our long conflict with 21 China. While on the one hand I was an ardent proponent of the adjustment of Japanese-American relations, on the other hand I advocated the opinion that we must be on guard against the U.S.S.R. The reasons for which I, who disapproved a friendship with the U.S.S.R.,

23

10

11

13

14

15

24

approved the Japanese-German-Russian combination were twofold: first, it was thought under the then prevailing circumstances that this would be the only way to reach an understanding with the United States; second, I believe that the danger from the U.S.S.R., against which we had to be on guard, could be satisfactorily mitigated by restraining her by ourselves in the east and by Germany in the west.

"As is clear from the record od the MATSUOKAStahmer conversations, Germany was under commitment to
assist Japan in adjusting her relations with Soviet
Russia, and Minister Stahmer, on leaving for his home
country, reiterated his intention to make an effort
for the realization of that objective. There is
reason to believe that, at least up until November
1940, when M. Molotov visited Berlin, Germany had been
moving in the direction of the Japanese-German-Russian
combination. For a memorandum was sent by Herr von
Ribbentrop to the Japanese Government, in which he
proposed that: A pact shall be concluded between
Japan, Germany, and Italy as one party and the U.S.S.R.
es the other, in which:

"1. The U.S.S.R. should agree in principle to the Tripartite Alliance as a means of checking the spread of war and speedily restoring world peace;

ing position of Germany and Italy in Europe and of Japan in the Far East, and the three Powers should pledge themselves to respect the territorial integrity of U.S.S.R.

"3. The three Powers and U.S.S.R. should pledge themselves not to assist any Power, or join any group or Powers, which are at war with the other contracting party.

"Besides, the four contracting Powers should enter into a secret understanding that the Far East, Iran and India, Central Africa be recognized as the spheres of influence in the future of Japan, the U.S.S.R., Germany, and Italy respectively.

"Our Covernment accepted the scheme and Herr Ribbentrop presented it to M. Molotov in November of that year.

"Thus the Tripartite Alliance was concluded on the theory that the U.S.S.R. would join the future. A totally different situation, however, awaited Mr. "ATSUOKA in Berlin when he visited there in March 1940" -- that should be 1941, your Honor. "Both Herr Hitler and Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop pointed out instances of bad faith and outrageous conducts of Soviet Russia. They revealed to Mr. MATSUOKA, with

4

7

8

10

12

14

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

28 24

25

reference to the Ribbentrop memorandum mentioned above, that M. Molotov, while accepting it in principle, put forward in return over thirty items as counter-proposals which it was quite out of the question for Germany to consider. They also insisted that the root of European troubles could not be removed unless a severe blow was dealt to Soviet Russia. In short, Germany's Soviet policy had been completely reversed since the conclusion of the Alliance in the previous year.

"Mr. MATSUOKA made it clear that Japan could not easily agree to a German war against Russia because she would be immensely affected by such an eventuality. He further confided his intention to meet the Soviet leaders in Moscow on his way home, with a view to adjusting relations between the two countries. Herr von Ribbentrop commented on this by saying that, since Soviet Russia could not be trusted, any such attempt would be futile, and, when asked by Mr. MATSUO-KA what would be the outcome if he succeeded in coming to some concrete agreement with the Soviet Government, replied that there would be no objection to such an agreement, although he could hardly see any use in such negotiations. (Such was the verbal report Mr. MATSUOKA presented to his home government on his return from Europe.)

"MR. MATSUOKA negotiated on his return trip
in Noscow with the Russian leaders and succeeded,
contrary to the German expectation, in concluding a
Neutrality Pact. According to Ambassador OSHIMA's
reports to Tokyo, Herr Hitler looked rather astonished
at this news, nor did Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop
conceal his unpleasant surprise when he told our
Ambassador that he found it difficult to understand
Mr. MATSUOKA's real intentions in concluding such a
treaty with the very country with whom Germany would
fight in the near future as he had explained to Mr.
MATSUOKA so plainly.

"Thus, great was the discrepancy between
Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop's understanding and
that of Mr. MATSUOKA on the same subject. Regardless
of whether it was due to mutual misunderstanding or to
wilful distortion on either side, the fact remained
that German-Soviet relations had rapidly become so bad
after April that all the reports from Ambassador
OSHIMA hinted the imminence of war between the two
Powers. Our government could no longer placidly watch
the development of the situation. Therefore on 28
May 1941, Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, on behalf of our
government, sent a message to Foreign Minister von
Ribbentrop to the effect that, in view of the external

as well as internal situation in Japan, he wished the German Government to avoid an armed conflict with the U.S.S.R. by every means at its disposal. German Foreign Minister's reply was that war with the U.S.S.R. was now unavoidable, but he gave assurance that it would not last longer than two or three months at most; and asked that he be trusted on this point. He further reminded that Japan was not being asked to give any assistance in that war and that, besides, she would benefit considerably from its outcome. The highest German military authorities also told Ambassador OSHIMA that the war would probably end within four weeks. It would hardly be called a war, but rather a police action.

19 20

14

15

16

17

18

21

22 23

24

.25

Morse & Lefle

1.2

"On the 22nd of June the war broke out. The United States and Great Britain took no time in declaring intention to aid the U. S. S. R; the U. S. S. R. had now unmistakably joined the Anglo-American camp. Although this sudden turn in the international situation did not immediately affect Russo-Japanese relations, the hope that Japan, Germany and the U. S. S. R. might become united - the keynote of the Tri-Partite Alliance had now been shattered, and with communications between Japan and Germany. The Tri-Partite Alliance had been deprived of most of its practical usefulness.

"If we call it the first German breach of faith that, while approaching the Japanese Government headed by HIRANUMA with a proposal for a tri-partite alliance directed against Soviet Russia, she suddenly concluded, without any previous notice to us a non-aggression pact with that very Soviet Russia. Then might we call it the second German act of a similar nature that, notwithstanding the pledge entered into when the Tri-Partite Alliance was concluded to make an ally of Russia, she waged war upon Soviet Russia, disregarding our urgent reminding. Japan, then, might very well claim freedom, legal as well as moral to reexamine her whole policy pertaining to the Alliance.

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

As a matter of fact, I had informal conversations with the ministers of the fighting services as to the desirability of denouncing it outright in view of the reasons and circumstances of the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Alliance. However, the army leaders who had great confidence in the German High Command would not listen to such opinion. Moreover, Germany's spectacular successes at the first stages of war seemed even to heighten that confidence.

"In such circumstances I reached the following conclusion. Reexamination of the Alliance policy was not feasible because of our internal political situation; besides to abrogate a treaty which had only in the preceding year been concluded would be contrary to our international faith, even though it was due to a perfidious act on the part of a cosignatory Power -- an act which scarcely constituted an excuse publicly acceptable. It was not appropriate, therefore, to challenge the Tri-Partite Alliance itself. But now the war had broken out between Germany and Russia and all hope of the Japanese-German-Russian combination, one of the main aims of the Alliance, had been dashed. Under the conditions it would be extremely grave for Japan if she should be drawn into the danger of a war with the United States, a danger which

19

21

22

23

24

might arise in the future from the Tri-Partite Alliance. Above all, this would completely nullify the aim for which we concluded the Alliance. Every precaution should therefore be taken against this danger.

"The way to that end, in my opinion, could be sought nowhere else than in closer relationship between Japan and America. And this possibility, though despaired of a year ago, had now become rather hopeful as the United States, impelled by the necessity of rescuing Great Britain in Europe, had been seeking to avoid at any cost an entanglement with Japan in the Pacific. In fact, the Japanese-American talks had been commenced in April of that year. It was out of such consideration that I made up my mind to bring the Japanese-American conversations to a successful conclusion at any cost -- even at the cost of more or less mitigating the Tri-Partite Alliance."

MR. COMYNE CARR: Your Honor, that passage which has just been read is not in the copy served upon us.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is page 9 of ours and looks like an addition.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am sorry. For some reason, there is a half page left blank, and it is printed with the certificate. I thought it was the certificate, there.

4

5

7

8

10

12 13

14

16 17

> 18 19

21

22

20

23 24

25

Your Honor, may I point out that the document contains -- this memorandum contains a number of references to documents not produced, particularly on page 7.

THE PRESIDENT: We accepted it only so far as it discloses Prince KONOE's reasons expressed on behalf of Japan for entering into those alliances.

MR. COMYNS CARR: So long as it is not accepted --

THE PRESIDENT: Before we accept any reference to the contents of a document, we must have the document or have its absence accounted for, that is, so far as the references are relied upon as proof of the contents of the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I understood that you mean the affidavits of witnesses, not necessarily reference in documents to other documents.

THE PRESIDENT: What Prince KONOE says as to the contents of the document will not be accented as proof of those contents.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The witness may be cross-examined.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: We do not desire to crossexamine the witness on this part of his affidavit.

The other part we will consider when we have seen the proposed exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there no contest about the genuineness of this particular document?

MR. COMYNS CARR: No, your Honor, as far as we know, as to the authenticity of this one, as having been written by Prince KONOE at the date the witness states.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was under the impression that the witness properly identified defense document 1580. Otherwise, I would like to ask him some questions which clarify that situation, because that is the purpose of the witness being here.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need to do that in view of Mr. Carr's admission.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I ask that the witness then be released on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was ex
cused.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I ask if the Tribunal has reached a decision on defense document 613-A (12) and (13), the interrogation of MATSUOKA.

THE PRESIDENT: We have not yet conferred on that.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I will defer that until -THE PRESIDENT: Until we are able to confer.
MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence
defense document 206-G, an excerpt from Ambassador
Grew's book "Ten Years in Japan," to show --

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document -
BRIGADIER NOLAN: May I be heard? I thought

counsel had not finished his remarks in introducing the

document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, I was stopped by the light.

(Continuing) To show that on 19 October
1939 Ambassador Grew, who returned from his vacation
in the United States, delivered a speech in the AmericanJapanese Society in Tokyo, strongly denouncing the
Japanese policy in China; that Ambassador Grew knew
the speech was a sort of dynamite going directly to
the Japanese public over the head of the Japanese
Government and outside the usual diplomatic procedure,
and would cause strong reaction in Japan. This is a
preliminary for the following documents which show bad
effects this speech had on the Japanese-American relations.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution object to a portion of this document. The first two paragraphs consist of the reflections and ruminations of a gentleman about to make a speech, and, in our submission, there is nothing in those two first paragraphs which could assist this Tribunal. We make no objection to the report of the speech itself. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham, are you going to say anything in support of those first two paragraphs? MR. CUNNINGHAM: I was going to suggest that the first two paragraphs explain pretty much the background for the speech, and both should be read together. But, I do not want to insist upon it unless -- the Court can see the value in it by reading it, of course. THE PRESIDENT: Well, only the speech is admitted. The objection is upheld to that extent. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 206-G will receive exhibit No. 2736. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2736 and received in evidence.) THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was

.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I will ask Mr. Blewett to read exhibit 2736, that part which is to be read.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blowett.

MR. BLEWETT: (Reading) "Straight from the Horse's Mouth."

"(From an Address Before the America-Japan Society, October 19, 1939).

"We have a phrase in English 'straight from
the horse's mouth.' I never knew why the particular
animal chosen was a horse, especially as most horses
are generally not very communicative. But the meaning
is clear enough. What I shall say in Japan in the
ensuing months comes 'straight from the horse's mouth'
that it will accurately represent and interpret some
of the current thoughts of the American Government and
people with regard to Japan and the Far East. I had the
privilege of also conferring repeatedly with the President
and with the Secretary of State during my stay at home.

"Before I left for America last May a Japanese friend of mine begged me to tell my friends in America the situation in Japanese-American relations as he conceived it. It ran somewhat as follows:

"American rights and interests in China are suffering some minor and unimportant inconveniences in China as a result of Japanese military operations; the Japanese military take every possible precaution to avoid inconvenience to American interests; reports published in the United States in regard to damage to American interests by the Japanese in China are intentionally exaggerated in order to inflame the American people against Japan; in large measure those activities of the Japanese to which Americans object are the result of differences in customs, differences in language, and a legalistic attitude which has been adopted by the United States; the attitude of the Government of the United States in regard to impairment of American rights and interests in the Japaneseoccupied areas of China is in large part due to internal political conditions in the United States; in the near future the situation in the occupied areas of China will be so improved that the United States will no longer have any cause for complaint. That was the point of view of my Japanese friend.

1

2

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Alas, the truth is far otherwise. The facts, as they exist, are accurately known by the American Government. They are likewise known by the American people, and in the interests of the future relations

7 8

between Japan and the United States those facts must be faced. Only through consideration of those facts can the present attitude of the American Government and people toward Japan be understood; only through consideration of those facts, and through constructive steps to alter those facts, can Japanese-American relations be improved. Those relations must be improved.

"Having said all this I do not propose today to deal in detail with the causations which have brought about that feeling in my country. This is not the occasion to enter any 'bill of particulars.' Those facts, those difficulties between our nations, are matters for consideration by the two Governments; indeed, some of them are matters which I have been discussing with the Japanese Government during the past two years, and I shall continue to approach these matters. But I believe that the broad outline of those facts and difficulties are known to you. Some of these difficulties are serious.

"Now, many of you who are listening to me may well be thinking 'There are two sides to every picture; we in Japan also have our public opinion to consider.' Granted. In America, as I have already said, I did my best to show various angles of the Japanese point of view. But here in Japan I shall try to show the American

point of view. Without careful consideration of both points of view we can get nowhere in building up good relations. I wish you could realize how intensely I wish for that most desirable end and how deeply I desire, by pure objectivity, to contribute to a successful outcome. Let me therefore try to remove a few utterly fallacious conceptions of the /merican attitude as I think they exist in Japan today.

B

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

19

22

"One of these fallacies is that the American approach to affairs in East Asia is bound by a purely 'legalistic' attitude, a conception which widely prevails in this country today. What is meant by a 'legalistic' attutude? If we mean respect for trenties, official commitments, international law, yes; that respect is and always will be one of the cardinal principles of American policy. But the very term 'a legalistic attitude, ' as it has often been used in my hearing in Japan, seems to imply a position where one cannot see the woods for the trees, where one's vision of higher and broader concepts is stultified. Let me 21 therefore touch briefly on a few of the cardinal principles of American policy and objectives, molded to meet the requirements of modern life, which, it is true, are fundamentally based upon but which seem to me far to transcend any purely 'legalistic' approach

point of view. Without careful consideration of both points of view we can get nowhere in building up good relations. I wish you could realize how intensely I wish for that most desirable end and how deeply I desire, by pure objectivity, to contribute to a successful outcome. Let me therefore try to remove a few utterly fallacious conceptions of the /merican attitude as I think they exist in Japan today.

10

11

13

14

16

17

23

"One of these fallacies is that the American approach to affairs in East Asia is bound by a purely 'legalistic' attitude, a conception which widely prevails in this country today. What is meant by a 'legalistic' attutude? If we mean respect for trenties, official commitments, international law, yes; that respect is and always will be one of the cardinal principles of American policy. But the very term 'a legalistic attitude, ' as it has often been used in my hearing in Japan, seems to imply a position where one cannot see the woods for the trees, where one's vision of higher and broader concepts is stultified. Let me 21 therefore touch briefly on a few of the cardinal principles of American policy and objectives, molded to meet the requirements of modern life, which, it is true, are fundamentally based upon but which seem to me far to transcend any purely 'legalistic' approach

to world affairs.

"The American people aspire to relations of perce with every country and between all countries. We have no monopoly on this desire for peace, but we have a very definite conviction that the sort of peace which, throughout history, has been merely an interlude between wars is not an environment in which world civilization can be stably developed or, perhaps, can even be preserved. We believe that international peace is dependent on what our Secretary of State has characterized as 'orderly processes' in international dealing.

"The American people desire to respect the sovereign rights of other people and to have their own sovereign rights equally respected. We have found by experience that the successful approach to the resolving of international disputes lies not so much in merely abstaining from the use of force as in abstaining from any thought of the use, immediately or eventually, of the methods of force. Let cynics look about them and contemplate the consequences of resort to menacing demands as a process in the conduct of international relations! It is being purely 'legalistic' to put to wise and practical use the finer instincts common to all mankind?

"The American people believe that the day is past when wars can be confined in their effects to the combatant nations. When national economics were based upon agriculture and handicraft, nations were to a large extent self-sufficient; they lived primarily on the things which they themselves grew or produced. That is not the case today. Nations are now increasingly dependent on others both for commodities which they do not produce themselves and for the disposal of the things which they produce in excess. The highly complex system of exchange of goods has been evolved by reason of each nation's being able to extract from the ground or to manufacture certain commodities more efficiently or economically than others. Each contributes to the common good the fruits of its handiwork and the bounties of nature.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

only raised the standard of living everywhere but has made it possible for two or even three persons to live in comfort where but one had lived in discomfort under a simple self-contained economy. Not only the benefits of our advanced civilization but the very existence of most of us depend on maintaining in equilibrium a delicate balanced and complex world economy. Wers are not only destructive of the wealth,

disturb the fine adjustments of world economy. Conflict between nations is therefore a matter of concern to all the other nations. Is there then any stultification through 'legalistic' concepts when we practice ourselves and urge upon others the resolving of international disputes by orderly processes, even if it were only in the interests of world economy? How, except on the basis of law and order, can these various concepts in international dealing be secured?

"The American people believe in equality of commercial opportunity. There is probably no nation which has not at one time or other invoked it. Even Japan, where American insistence on the Open Door is cited as the supreme manifestation of what is characterized as a 'legalistic' American attitude -- even Japan, I say -- has insisted upon and has received the benefits of the Open Loor in areas other than China, where, we are told, the principle is inapplicable except in a truncated and emasculated form. That highly complicated system of world economy of which I have just spoken is postulated upon the ability of nations to buy and sell where they please under conditions of free competition -- conditions which cannot exist in areas where pre-emptive rights are claimed and

asserted on behalf of nationals of one particular country.

"I need hardly say that the thoughts which I have just expressed are of universal applicability.

·

"Another common fallacy which I am constrained to mention is the charge that the american Government and people do not understand 'the new order in East Asia.' Forgive me if I very respectfully take issue with that conception. The American Government and people understand what is meant by the 'new order in East Asia! precisely as clearly as it is understood in Japan. The 'new order in East Asia' has been officially defined in Japan as an order of security, stability, and progress. The American Government and people earnestly desire security, stability, and progress not only for themselves but for all other nations in every quarter of the world. But the new order in East Asia has appeared to include, among other things, depriving Americans of their long-established rights in China, and to this the american people are opposed.

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

"There's the story. It is probably that many of you are not aware of the increasing extent to which the people of the United States resent the methods which the Japanese armed forces are employing in China today and what appear to be their objectives. In saying this, I do not wish for one moment to imply that the American people have forgotten the long-time friendship which has existed between the people of my country and the people of Japan. But the American people have been

1 profoundly shocked over the widespread use of bombing 2 in China, not only on grounds of humanity but also on 3 grounds of the direct menace to American lives and 4 property accompanied by the loss of American life and the crippling of American citizens; they regard 6 with growing seriousness the violation of and inter-7 ference with American rights by the Japanese armed forces in China in disregard of treaties and agreements entered into by the United States and Japan and treaties and agreements entered into by several nations, including Japan. The American people know that those treaties and agreements were entered into voluntarily by Japan and that the provisions of those treaties and agreements constituted a practical arrangement for safeguarding -for the benefit of all -- the correlated principles of national sovereignty and of equality of economic opportunity.

"The principle of equality of economic opportunity is one to which, over a long period and on many occasions, Japan has given definite approval and upon which Japan has frequently insisted. Not only are the American people perturbed over their being arbitrarily deprived of long-established rights, including those of equal opportunity and fair treatment, but they feel that the present trend in the Far East, if continued,

19

12

13

15

16

17

18

20 21

22 23

24

cherish of the development of an orderly world. American rights and interests in China are being impaired or
destroyed by the policies and actions of the Japanese
authorities in China. American property is being
damaged or destroyed; American nationals are being
endangered and subjected to indignities. If I felt
in a position to set forth all the facts in detail

endangered and subjected to indignities. If I felt in a position to set forth all the facts in detail today, you would, without any question, appreciate the soundness and full justification of the American attitude. Perhaps you will also understand why I wish today to exercise rostraint.

will be destructive of the hopes which they sincerely

"In short, the American people, from all the thoroughly reliable evidence that comes to them, have good reason to believe that an effort is being made to establish control, in Japan's own interest, of large areas on the continent of Asia and to impose upon those areas a system of closed economy. It is this thought, added to the effect of the bombings, the indignities, the manifold interference with American rights, that accounts for the attitude of the American people toward Japan today. For my part I will say this. It is my belief, and the belief of the American Government and people, that the many things injurious to the United States which have been done and are being done

by Japanese agencies are wholly needless. We believe that real security and stability in the Far East could be attained without running counter to any American rights whatsoever.

2

5

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

"I have tried to give an accurate interpretation of American public opinion, most carefully studied and analyzed by me while at home. The traditional friendship between our two nations is far too precious a thing to be either inadvertently or deliberately impaired. It seems to me logical that from every point of view -- economic, financial, commercial, in the interests of business, travel, science, culture, and sentiment -- Japan and the United States forever should be mutually considerate friends. In the family of nations, as between and among brothers, there arise inevitable controversies, but again and again the United States has demonstrated its practical sympathy and desire to be helpful toward Japan in difficult times and moments, its admiration of Japan's achievements, its earnest desire for mutually helpful relations.

"Please do not misconstrue or misinterpret the attitude which has prompted me to speak in the utmost frankness today. I am moved first of all by love of my own country and my devotion to its interest; but I am also moved by very deep affection for Japan and

my sincere conviction that the real interests, the fundamental and abiding interests, of both countries call for harmony of thought and action in our relationships. Those who know my sentiments for Japan, developed in happy contacts during the seven years in which I have lived here among you, will realize, I am sure, that my words and my actions are those of a true friend.

"One Japanese newspaper queried, on my return from America, whether I had concealed in my bosom a dagger or a dove. Let me answer that query. I have nothing concealed in my bosom except the desire to work with all my mind, with all my heart, and with all my strength for Japanese-American friendship.

"Today I have stated certain facts, straightforwardly and objectively. But I am also making a plea
for sympathetic understanding in the interests of the
old, enduring friendship between our two great nations.
In a world of chaos I plead for stability, now and in
the long future, in a relationship which, if it can be
preserved, can bring only good to Japan and to the
United States of America."

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, there is an obvious error in the tenth line on page 3; the words "It is" should obviously be "Is it."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Defense document 206-E-4, do you have it?

Will you check and see what the situation is on it? It isn't in my list.

We will go to defense document 1635. I now offer in evidence defense document No. 1635, a telegram from Ott to German Foreign Office, dated 20 October 1939, to show the strong reaction of the Japanese public to Ambassador Grew's speech as seen by the German Ambassador in Tokyo, which casted an ill omen for the pro-American policy of the ABE Cabinet.

Skipping the formal parts: "No. 607 of 20.10"
Will you please give it an exhibit number?
THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1635
will receive exhibit No. 2737.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2737 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Reading) "The top news of the press is the speech in the American-Japanese club here of Ambassador Grew who recently returned from America. The ambassador avowed at the beginning to be a friend of Japan of many years and stated the improvement of the American-Japanese relations as his

4 5

7 8

life-work.

by the Japanese action in China, which hit the American interests most severely. The American public opinion is therefore unanimously against Japan. The ambassador demanded with unusual sharpness respect of the Nine-Powers Treaty and return to the open door, which Japan wishes to concede to the other powers in China only in a completely depreciated form.

The carrying out is made especially difficult

"The press described in its first commentaries the speech as a sharp refusal of the China-policy of Japan. The always proclaimed attempt of compromise with America thus began unfavorable for the ABE Cabinet. Telegraphic reports will follow as soon as further effects become visible." Signed "Ott."

I next offer in evidence defense document 1400-E-3, an excerpt taken from "Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan 1931 - 1941," a telegram from Ambassador Grew to Hull dated 23 October 1939, to show the reaction of the Japanese Foreign Office to the aforementioned speech of Ambassador Grew.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1400-E-3

will receive exhibit No. 2738.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit

No. 2738 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Skipping the formal parts:
"The Ambassador in Japan (Grew) to the Secretary of
State. Tokyo, October 23, 1939 -- 10 p.m. (Received
October 23 -- 1:17 p.m.)

"544. Our 543, October 23, 7:17 p.m. Yakichiro SUMA, newly-appointed Foreign Office spokesman
and formerly Councillor in Washington, gave a long
interview to the foreign correspondents today in regard
to Japanese-American relations. While these correspendents are understood to have cabled the significant
portions thereof to their papers in the United States,
in view of Mr. SUMA's position, it is believed that the
Department may wish to have the contents of his interview as reported here which were substantially as
follows:

"Question: Are you handling Ambassador Grew's address given at the Imperial Hotel as an official protest, or have you received an official protest with similar contents?

"Answer: We do not regard it as an official protest nor have we received such an official protest.

What is Japan's view in regard "Question: to that speech?

"Answer: For a diplomat to report accurately the feeling of his country to the country to which he is accredited takes an unusual amount of courage and I am deeply impressed with Mr. Grew's action. However, it is difficult to agree with the Ambassador's statement that the American public has a correct grasp of the situation in East Asia. From my own experiences in America there has been deplorable ignorance among the people concerning conditions in the Far East. Recently, I read Hugh Wilson's book entitled 'Memoirs of a Diplomat' in which he states that as the American people are geographically too well blessed, public opinion in regard to foreign affairs is one of a serious character and I am in agreement with him. American views with regard to the Far East are completely directed by emotion. The American Government and people should pay full attention to actual facts of the situation in East Asia and their opinion should be more constructive and practical.

"Question: As the treaty expires next January 18, the view is strong here, the United States will cease buying Japanese silk and Japan will

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

K

n

a p

p

&

G

r

e

e

n

b

e

r

g

&

R

1

h

r

cease buying American cotton. What do you think of that?

"Answer: I heard this sort of view quite often while in the United States. I even heard that all trade relations would cease. However, this would amount to aggressive action against Japan and as it would not bring the result desired by the United States the majority of opinion inclined to the view that it could be spoken of lightly. As Walter Lippmann has said, the responsibility for the adjustment of Japanese-American relations rests not only with Japan, the United States also must exert every effort to observe the road to adjustment.

"Question: What do you think about the rumour that a four-power conference including Japan, England, France and the United States will be held to discuss the question of opening the Yangtze River to navigation?

"Answer: That is purely conjecture, France and England would not have to be mentioned. If necessary, discussions could be carried on with the United States. In any case the question of opening the Yangtze to navigation is not to be dismissed lightly."

"Copies by air mail to Shanghai and Peiping. Shanghai requested to repeat to Chungking by naval radio."

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer for identifica-

3

Signed "Grew"

7

5

from, defense document 1656A to AD, for evidence.
This is an official top-secret document of the

tion defense document 1656 and tender excerpts there-

8

9

Japanese Foreign Office entitled "Outline of the

10

Process of Drafting Various Drafts Concerning the

11

Tripartite Pact of Japan, Germany and Italy, and

12 13 Pertaining Documents." This document was compiled by Mr. MATSUMOTO, Director of the Treaty Department of

14

the Foreign Office at the time of the conclusion of the

15

Pact, and show that no aggressive intention was expressed by any party during the negotiations.

16 17

Annex 1 to 20 are marked as B to Z and AA

18

to AD, which I do not wish to read unless specifically

19

asked by the Court or the Prosecution. However, I

20 21 believe that the documents supporting the statement will be of valuable assistance to the Tribunal for

22

understanding the background of the Tripartite Pact.

23

I only propose to read the "Outline of the Process of Drafting Various Drafts Concerning the Tripartite Pact."

25

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

,

7 8

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, this document appears to consist of 36 excerpts from a document of which the original is Japanese, although a hasty glance over the original document shows a few to be in English. There has been no service of this document upon the prosecution and no attempt to comply with Rule 6b(1), as amended, until yesterday. The document was lodged with the Clerk yesterday but we have not been able to have access to it, due to its probable use in Court today.

We desire to accommodate the defense in every way we can in cooperating and waiving rules where that can be done safely, but that, we take it, is no reason for totally ignoring the rules in regard to these matters.

THE PRESIDENT: You have not had time, you say to consider whether you should object?

MR. TAVENNER: No sir. We have not read a single one of the documents. We have not compared them with the original, and none of the precautionary matters have been taken which we would ordinarily follow in a matter of this kind, and if I did not so state or make it plain, none of the excerpts have been served on the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: The Clerk of the Court tells

me that she does not have copies of the excerpts for distribution.

3

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Do you have the copies of h656A, the first excerpt?

5

7

8

MR. TAVENNER: There is an indication that possibly the defense counsel do not realize that Rule 6b(1), as amended, must be complied with. We have insisted upon it at all times, but have been very liberal in waiving it wherever it could be done.

9

10

11

THE PRESIDENT: It is obvious that Mr. Cunningham thought the rule had been complied with, but apparently there has been some breakdown.

12

14

15

The Marshal and the Language Section want to see me during the luncheon adjournment, to complain about the failure of the Defense to comply with requirements in respect to their sections. Whose fault it is I do not know

16 17

fault it is, I do not know.

18

19

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, may I answer the objection now to the document? In the first place,

20

I do not think it comes under 6b(1) because I am not

21

asking that the document be admitted and read into the record. I am only asking that the English copy be

23

admitted at this time--a few of the excerpts which are

24

in English, and the original document is in English. As I explained yesterday, these negotiations were

3 4

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

19

18

21

23

24

25

me that she does not have copies of the excerpts for distribution.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Do you have the copies of h656A, the first excerpt?

MR. TAVENNER: There is an indication that possibly the defense counsel do not realize that Rule 6b(1), as amended, must be complied with. We have insisted upon it at all times, but have been very liberal in waiving it wherever it could be done.

THE PRESIDENT: It is obvious that Mr. Cunningham thought the rule had been complied with, but apparently there has been some breakdown.

The Marshal and the Language Section want to see me during the luncheon adjournment, to complain about the failure of the Defense to comply with requirements in respect to their sections. Whose fault it is, I do not know.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, may I answer the objection now to the document? In the first place, I do not think it comes under 6b(1) because I am not asking that the document be admitted and read into the record. I am only asking that the English copy be admitted at this time -- a few of the excerpts which are in English, and the original document is in English. As I explained yesterday, these negotiations were

conducted in English, and that perhaps a few of the excerpts are in Japanese, but the document which I want to read in evidence is in English.

THE PRESIDENT: To say the least, that explanation is inadequate.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: And I contend that 6b does not apply. I shouldn't think the documents which were originally in English--that the excerpts taken from them have to be lodged with the Clerk. Maybe there was some misunderstanding there.

Now, on the proposition of seven days and compliance, I want you to know that we went on a little early with this phase of the case and perhaps some of the machinery did not have a chance to function.

THE PRESIDENT: We think the rules apply, and they must be observed. You had better present some other document, Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The second document of the series, which was commenced yesterday with exhibit No. 2734, is an excerpt taken from No. 1400-B-3. It is an excerpt taken from Foreign Relations of the United States and Japan from 1931 to 1941, a telegram from Ambassador Grew to Secretary of State Hull, dated 5 October 1940, which shows the explanation handed by Foreign Minister MATSUOKA to Grew regarding the peaceful and defensive purpose of the Tri-Partite Pact. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1400-B-3 will receive exhibit No. 2739. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2739 and received in evidence.) MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Levin will read the document.

MR. LEVIN (reading):

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

21

24

25

"Tokyo, October 5, 1940 - 10 p.m. (Received October 5 - 5:31 p.m.).

"948. The Foreign Minister asked me to come this afternoon to his private residence informally and alone "for a cup of tea" and for two hours and a quarter he talked on a variety of subjects. His discourse was largely of a historical and philosophical

"nature but outstanding points will be reported in separate telegrams tonight and tomorrow. At the commencement of the talk Mr. Matsuoka communicated orally in English and handed to me the Japanese taxt of 'a statement to the United States concerning the

"'A statement to the United States concerning the three-power alliance.

three-power alliance of which our translation follows.

"The recent three-power alliance is not aimed at any particular country. If Japan, Germany and Italy unite, the probability of being attacked by another country is decreased, the spreading of world disorder may be prevented, and in this sense the alliance contributes to world peace. By this treaty Japan has further clarified its intention to establish a new order in greater East Asia including the South Seas.

"The construction of a new order in East Asia means the construction of a new order under which Japan establishes the relationship of common existence and mutual prosperity with the peoples of each and every land in greater East Asia, that is East Asia including the South Seas. In a position of equality with every other country, Japan may freely carry on enterprises, trade and emigration in and to each

"'and every land in greater East Asia and thereby be enabled to solve its population problem. This does not mean that these areas are to be exploited and conquered, nor does it mean these areas are to be closed to the trade and enterprises of other countries. Japan has long tried to solve its population problem through emigration, trade and enterprises abroad, but the various countries of Europe and America have nullified Japan's reasonable and peaceful efforts concerning its population problem since those countries have

turned back Japanese immigrants to their great terri-

tories and have obstructed trade and enterprise.

"'In the greater East Asia sphere of mutual prosperity, the endeavor is being made to abolish such
unnatural restrictions on the free activities of
mankind. It is expected that this endeavor will be
accomplished insofar as possible through peaceful means
and with the least possible undesirable change in the
status quo.

"'Japan's policy toward China forms an important part of the above endeavor. However, owing to the lack of understanding on the part of some Chinese people and to the attitude taken by England and the United States in not recognizing Manchukuo, which gave rise to Chiang Kai-shek's hope of recovering l'anchukuo, an unfortunate

"iclash of arms broke out. This clash is, in fact, war and therefore it is impossible for the Japanese Army during its activities to avoid affecting rights and interests of the powers in China. This is particularly true when such rights and interests hinder the prosecution of Japan's war against China. Accordingly, if the effects upon these rights and interests are to be brought to an end, it is most desirable to encourage and promote peace between Japan and China. This fact notwithstanding the powers are not only checking Japan's actions through legalistic arguments and treaty pronouncements which have become inapplicable because of changing conditions, but are also oppressing Japan through such means as restriction on the exportation of important commodities to Japan and at the same time are giving positive aid to Japan's enemy, the Chiang Kaishek regime. These actions spring from hidden motives to keep the Orient under conditions of disorder as long as possible and to consume Japan's national strength. "e must believe that these actions are not for the love of peace and are not for the purpose of protecting rights and interests. Japan concluded a defensive alliance with Germany and Italy for no other purpose than to resist such pressure from the powers, and there is not the slightest intention to proceed to

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

"'to attack another country. If the United States understands the aforementioned conditions and circumstances and Japan's intentions with regard to the establishment of a new order in East Asia, there will be no change whatever in the relationship between Japan and the United States following the conclusion of this treaty. Japan is determined to settle all pending questions and to promote and foster friendship with the United States.'"

"Grew."

is the address by MATSUOKA at the Governors Conference on 7 October, 1940 in which MATSUOKA explained the international situation which formed the background of the Tri-Partite Pact and the peaceful purpose of the pact.

We now offer defense document 837. This

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

bunal, we object to defense document 837 which purports to set out in great detail the international atmosphere in which the pact was formed. It goes on to point out that the fundamental conflict between Japan and China is ideological and then discusses foreign relations with other countries, mentioning the European War, the Dutch East Indies and French Indo China, and the Soviet Union. This speech, delivered at a Governors Conference, is, in the submission of the prosecution, without any probative value. It is full of political platitudes and, we submit, should be rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honors please, the document answers all of the objections which the prosecution had to other documents. It is contemporaneous with the signing, or a few days after the signing, of the Tri-Partite Pact. It is the govern-

ment's official communication to the Governors of Japan of the interpretation of the Tri-Partite Pact. Nothing could be more indicative of public opinion and feeling of the time.

THE PRESIDENT: So far as it states the reasons for the signing of the pact, given at the time by the Foreign Minister, it may be useful.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: It definitely gives the background and the considerations which went into the signing and negotiation of the Tri-Partite Pact as uttered by the man who took the responsibility for the negotiation and the conclusion of the pact.

THE PRESIDENT: We think probably it contains a lot of material that is not properly admissible. On the other hand, it may have something in it worth reading or of some value. We will look through it during the luncheon adjournment, and we invite you to do the same, Mr. Cunningham, with a view to cutting it down.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is agreeable, your Honor, and I will try to get it right down to rock bottom declaration on the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was

dent.... 1

Spratt & Yelden

1.2

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin, we notice that according to this speech by MATSUOKA of the 7 October 1940, speeches on the Tri-Partite Pact were delivered about that time by both Prince KONOYE and MATSUOKA.

MATSUOKA's speech appears to have been on the day the Pact was signed and Prince KONOYE's on the following day. Those speeches may be in evidence already, but I do not think they are. If they are, what more do we want?

Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If the Tribunal please, the speech of Foreign Minister MATSUOKA on the 21 January 1941, defense document 310, is an exhibit in the case, number 1300.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, it seems to me as I recall, and I follow the record very carefully, that this address does not appear in the record. It is dated October 7, 1940, shortly after the Tri-Partite Pact was executed, and it seems to us that it is perfectly proper to submit it in evidence even though Prince KONOYE's statement has already been introduced

1.2

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Levin, we notice that according to this speech by MATSUOKA of the 7 October 1940, speeches on the Tri-Partite Pact were delivered about that time by both Prince KONOYE and MATSUOKA.

MATSUOKA's speech appears to have been on the day the Pact was signed and Prince KONOYE's on the following day. Those speeches may be in evidence already, but I do not think they are. If they are, what more do we want?

Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If the Tribunal please, the speech of Foreign Minister MATSUOKA on the 21 January 1941, defense document 310, is an exhibit in the case, number 1300.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, it seems to me as I recall, and I follow the record very carefully, that this address does not appear in the record. It is dated October 7, 1940, shortly after the Tri-Partite Pact was executed, and it seems to us that it is perfectly proper to submit it in evidence even though Prince KONOYE's statement has already been introduced

in evidence.

1.2

THE PRESIDENT: Prince KONOYE's statement was made just before his death. It was not a speech. That is what is being admitted. Now in the document you are tendering and which you ask us to accept it appears that on the day the Tri-Partite Pact was made Prince KONOYE made a speech -- or on the day after -- and on the very day the Pact was made the Foreign Minister MATSUOKA made a speech. Those are the speeches we should have if we have any.

MR. LEVIN: I can't say with reference to the speech of the 28th of September. This is the one of October 7 and comes within ten days after the execution of the Pact, and it seems to me it would be the one that would be most valuable in the consideration of this case.

THE PRESIDENT: There appears in the document now tendered -- I will read it -- "I believe that my speech broadcast on the evening of the same day," -- that is the day the Pact was signed -- "and also the address broadcast by Prime Minister KONOYE on the 28th, the following day, have clearly given the outline of it," -- that is, of the Pact. Where are those two speeches?

MR. LEVIN: The Prime Minister's speech, as

I understand it, is not in evidence but MATSUOKA's speech of the 27th is exhibit 777-A. I think that is the one concerning which there was considerable discussion about yesterday.

THE PRESIDENT: We were told yesterday that exhibit 777-A was not in evidence but tendered for identification.

MR. LEVIN: This particular document, if the Court please, is a more comprehensive speech than the others. It is a statement to the people of Japan and we believe is of great value.

THE PRESIDENT: That is the trouble. The speech that they made as soon as the Pact was signed would probably give their reasons. A speech made much later would probably be influenced by the way the Pact was received by the people of Japan; but we should have the speeches made on the day and the day after the Pact, those two speeches, that of Prince KONOYE and that of MATSUOKA.

MR. LEVIN: I am sure we will give that consideration, Mr. President, and if it is available we will produce it. I might say that during the noon hour we have edited this speech considerably and have deleted a very substantial portion of it, and if it is received I will indicate the portions that are to

be omitted.

THE PRESIDENT: You see, if we had those earlier speeches, we may decide that we had enough.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May I be permitted to make a remark, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: The radio broadcast of MATSUOKA is marked in the case as 777-A. I have sent for it to ascertain that it was delivered on the night of the 27th of September.

THE PRESIDENT: And is it in evidence?

BRIGADIER NOLAN: 777-A is marked as an exhibit in the case and is in evidence. It is a radio address by Mr. MATSUOKA dated the 27th of September, 1940, at 10:00 p.m.

THE PRESIDENT: The contrary was stated yesterday afternoon.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: What I said yesterday afternoon, Mr. President, was that 777, I assumed, had been marked for identification and that this was an excerpt from a book of radio addresses.

THE PRESIDENT: The contrary was not stated by you, Brigadier, but we were told to strike out the letter "A", that it was not in evidence.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: But I can assure you, sir,

that this 777-A is an exhibit in the caso.

THE PRESIDENT: Then we have Prince KONOYE's speech. Now what about MATSUOKA's speech on the same day?

MR. LEVIN: The exhibit which Brigadier
Nolan showed us indicated two sentences that were
marked and Mr. Cunningham is of the impression that
those were the only parts of that which were read.

It is my judgment, Mr. President, that as a matter of
fact this address should be more valuable than the
previous one because it was given a week, about ten
days, after the first one and Mr. MATSUOKA undoubtedly
had some time for reflection and probably included
many things that he said at the other time. This
was delivered to men who were very important in the
government of Japan, of high standing and influence,
and it would seem to be a very considered statement.

1 2

7 8

a long time after the event, and which may be colored by the reaction of the public in the meantime, are not the most reliable. As far as I am concerned, we want the speech delivered at the time if we can get it, and nothing else would be as reliable.

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, we shall make every effort to get it and offer it in evidence. Nevertheless, we feel that this is this is the most important statement in the entire group and believe that it should be admitted in evidence as edited.

THE PRESIDENT: This morning we admitted this statement by KONOYE just before his death, not believing or not knowing that he had made a speech on the very day of the pact, and that part of it at least was in evidence.

MR. LEVIN: Well, there is bound, Mr. President, to be some overlapping. I do not think there has been too much.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, before we admit this document we should know how you have edited it, Mr. Levin.

MR. LEVIN: I intend to read page 1 to the bottom of the last paragraph; page 2, beginning with the word "however" on the 5th line down to the word

"goods" about the middle of the page. I then omit
pages 3 to 8, and again read on page 8, beginning
on the third line, about six lines, and read the paxt
paragraph, omitting the balance of that page; beginning in the middle of page 9 and reading about
half of that page; page 10, reading the second half
of the page; reading page 11, the first part of
page 12, a paragraph on page 13, the last paragraph

Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that in the record at page 789 appears the excerpt from exhibit 777-A, and General Vasiliev read only one sentence, or rather two sentences, or rather a paragraph of that exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: According to the excerpt
from exhibit 777-A now before us, that speech of the
27th of September, 1940, was delivered by Prime
Minister Fumimaro KONOYE and not MATSUOKA. But
MATSUOKA said that he delivered a speech on the same
day, he also. Where is MATSUOKA's speech of the 27th
of September, 1940? We have his speech of January,
1941, being exhibit 1300.

MR. LEVIN: Apparently exhibit 777-A is MATSUOKA's speech of September 27, 1940.

1 2

on page 14, and page 15.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I can only go on the documents handed to me. If others have been more fortunate I congratulate them. This is defense document 155. It is signed, "Prime Minister Prince Fumimaro KONOME," and it is expressed to be an excerpt from prosecution document No. 777-A.

of the group of speeches in relation to the signing of the Tri-Partite Pact, and this is just one of them. The exhibit 777-4 is prosecution document No. 823 and is defense document No. 155.

THE PRESIDENT: If you will give me a copy of MATSUOKA's speech of the 27th of September, 1940, I will have no complaint, but I have yet to see it. I have Prince KONOYE's speech of that day but no speech by MATSUOKA.

("hereupon, a document was handed to the President.)

It appears there is tendered exhibit 777-A, radio address by MATSUOKA, dated 27 September 1940. If that is in evidence why do we want another speech of MATSUOKA?

MR. LEVIN: Mr. President, that exhibit indicates that the only portion that was read into the record was the portion that was marked on the

```
exhibit, and the page to which I called the attention
1
   of the Tribunal a moment ago, that was read by General
2
   Vasiliev.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
             Blade Schlese to - Yesok andries
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
exhibit, and the page to which I called the attention
1
    of the Tribunal a moment ago, that was read by General
    Vasiliev.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Kapleau & Wolf

THE PRESIDENT: Read the balance of the speech into the record if it helps you, Mr. Levin. But, why give us an entirely different speech ten days later?

MR. LEVIN: It is our judgment, Mr. President, that the address by MATSUOKA to the Governors was a much more comprehensive and better address. However, if it is the desire of the Tribunal that I shall read this entire document, 777-A, I shall be very happy to do it.

to have read only about half a paragraph of a fairly lengthy speech. On a matter of such great importance I think we would like to hear you, if you think the balance of the speech helps you. Having heard his first speech, before he knew the reaction of the Japanese public, perhaps we will think it would be more reliable than one made ten days later.

MR. LEVIN: (Reading)

"Radio address by Mr. Yosuke MATSUOKA, Minister for Foreign Affairs

"September 27, 1940

"Today on the occasion of the conclusion of the Three-Power Pact between Japan, Germany and Italy, an Imperial Rescript -- I am profoundly moved to say -- has been issued to the nation. What we,
His Majesty's subjects, should do has been plainly
indicated by the Prime Minister in his message.

I sincerely believe that it is incumbent upon all
of us to lay to heart the august will of our Sovereign
and put forth our best efforts in order to surmount
the current emergency.

"Our country is now faced with a most difficult situation, unparalleled in its history. What step we should take at this moment is a grave problem upon which hangs the fate of our nation. The Covernment, keenly conscious of the gravity of its responsibilities, is seeing to it that nothing shall come amiss.

is no other then to dispose of the China Affeir,
to construct a sphere of common prosperity in
Creater Fast Asia and to contribute thereby to the
establishment of true peace for the entire world.
But when we look at the actual international situation,
we find that this intention of Japan is not yet fully
understood. There are countries which have the
mistaken idea that peace means the mere maintenance
of the old order, or those which, while realizing
the inevitability of change, are reluctant to part

with the old order. Moreover, there are countries which attempt to obstruct directly or indirectly, our construction of a new order in Greater East Asia, and even those who resort to all sorts of stratagem in order to block the path of Japan's advance toward the fulfillment of her great historic mission—that of establishing world peace. The Japanese Government has assiduously striven to remedy this regrettable state of affairs. Nevertheless, I regret to say that the situation has not only failed to improve, but it has even shown signs of aggravation in certain quarters.

"Circumstances have now brought Japan to
the point where she can no longer permit the international
situation to drift as it will. At this juncture,
there is only one course for Japan to take. That
is to say, internally we should stand resolutely
together—one hundred million people as one—by
establishing speedily the new state structure for
national defense; and externally, we should first
unite with Germany and Italy which have the same
aspirations and policy as ours and later with those
Powers who can cooperate with us. We should thus
go fearlessly forward to carry out our conviction,
calling at the same time upon those Powers that

1 2

4

5

7

10

11

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

23

22

24

obstruct us to reconsider their attitude. In such manner, the Government expects to achieve the ultimate aim of our Yamato race--namely, the establishment of a new order in East Asia.

"Accordingly, we have conducted negotiation with the representatives of Germany and Italy, which have resulted in the conclusion of the Three-Power Pact, made public just a short while ago.

"The establishment of this historic relationship of alliance between the three countries, is, of course, due to the wisdom of our gracious Sovereign. At the same time it owes much to the judgment and decision of the eminent leaders of Germany and Italy --Chancellor Hitler and Premier Mussolini. Again, the German Foreign Minister, Mr. von Ribbentrop, has earnestly made efforts for German-Japanese cooperation from the very day he assumed his present rost, while the Italian Foreign Minister, Count Ciano, having been once stationed in East Asia, and understanding fully Japan's position in East Asia, has ceaselessly laboured for the promotion of Italo-Japanese firendship. Needless to say, these two foreign ministers have played important roles in the conclusion of the present pact.

"The ract provides that Japan, Germany and

Italy shall cooperate freely with one another toward the construction of a new order, respectively in Greater East Asia and in the regions of Europe, in which these Powers are at present engaged. It also provides that if any one of the Contracting Parties should be attacked by an outside Power, at present not involved in the European War or in the China Affair, the three Contracting Powers shall render mutual assistance with all possible means, political, economic and military. Accordingly, it does not mean that because of this pact Japan is to enter the European War at present, nor that she intends to challenge any Power without provocation. It may be added also that the present treaty will not affect in any way the existing political status between Japan, Germany and Italy on the one hand and Soviet Russia on the other.

"The treaty also provides that Germany and Italy recognize Japan's position of leadership in regard to the construction of a new order in Greater East Asia. We in turn recognize the leadership of Germany and Italy in the European regions where they are now engaged in the establishment of a new order, staking even their national existence in the undertaking. And thus the Three Powers are to join forces

20 21 22

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

and help one another to the utmost.

"With the conclusion of this treaty, Japan's responsibilities as leader of the new order in Greater East Asia becomes even greater than before. Although it is the intention of the Japanese Government to fulfill these responsibilities always by peaceful means, there is no telling whether there might not arise occasions and circumstances calling for a momentous decision on the part of our nation. Our future is beset with countless obstacles and difficulties, which, it must be fully realized, no ordinary effort will be sufficient to surmount. Our Government and people, united as one and grasping fully the situation both at home and abroad, should be prepared to endure all hardship and all sacrifices, and redouble their efforts so as to conform to the august will of our Sovereign."

18

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

23

24

. Now I would like to offer defense document 837, as I have indicated, with the editing and deletion that has been accomplished.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court overrules the objection and admits the document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Document 837 will receive exhibit No. 2740.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 2740 and received in evidence.)

MR. LEVIN (reading): "On September 27, the
Tri-partite Pact was concluded between Japan, Germany and Italy, and on the same day His Najesty the
Emperor was pleased to issue a gracious Imperial
Message indicating the direction which our people should
follow concerning this historic event, and we, the
subjects of Imperial Japan, are filled with trepidation. We who are in government service should, observing faithfully this Imperial command, be the first to
sacrifice ourselves to materialize it. With regard to
how to interpret this command, I believe that my speech
broadcast on the evening of the same day, and also the
address broadcast by Prime Minister KONOYE on the 28th,
the following day, have clearly given the outline of
it, and I am afraid it is hardly necessary for me here

again to talk about it.

"I believe, however, that in order to understand this Pact correctly, it is necessary to appreciate the international atmosphere in which this Pact was formed. For your information, therefore, I will briefly explain in what international atmosphere, and through what course, our country reached this conclusion."

THE PRESIDENT: Even MATSUOKA thought it wasn't worth while to say anything more about it.

MR. LEVIN: I now proceed to page 2, beginning with the fifth line.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: If it please the Tribunal, as I understand the ruling of the Tribunal, the document itself was admitted in evidence, the whole of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Only the parts that Mr. Levin indicated, and he went through the document and indicated the parts he did not propose to read.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May I, then, have permission to draw the attention of the Tribunel to one or two passages after Mr. Levin has completed his reading?

MR. LEVIN: I think, Mr. President, we discussed the matter very fully. The Court considered it and decided the matter and there should be no further discussion in relation to it.

THE PRESIDENT: We receive it only so far as it states the reasons for the Pact.

MR. LEVIN (reading continued): "However, when we think of the present situation of our country from the standpoint of our foreign policy, we are confronted with the huge problems of how we should support our ever-increasing population and how we should increase our national wealth, which is remarkably meagre compared with that of the two great western nations, Great Britain and the United States of America. In order to get a solution for these problems, our Government has long been striving for overseas expansion of our people by means of foreign trade, emigration, overseas enterprises, etc. However, several nations both in Europe and America have been and are interferring with our overseas development, using such measures as prohibiting or restricting Japanese emigrants, imposing heavy customs duties on Japanese goods, etc."

I turn to page 8, beginning with the first sentence on that page:

"Fowever, the governments of Great Britain and the United States have made various protests against our Government because they probably misunderstood that Japan was going to occupy French-Indo China by

2

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: We receive it only so far as it states the reasons for the Pact.

MR. LEVIN (reading continued): "However, when we think of the present situation of our country from the standpoint of our foreign policy, we are confronted with the huge problems of how we should support our ever-increasing population and how we should increase our national wealth, which is remarkably meagre compared with that of the two great western nations, Great Britain and the United States of America. In order to get a solution for these problems, our Government has long been striving for overseas expansion of our people by means of foreign trade, emigration, overseas enterprises, etc. However, several nations both in Europe and America have been and are interferring with our overseas development, using such measures as prohibiting or restricting Japanese emigrants, imposing heavy customs duties on Japanese goods, etc."

I turn to page 8, beginning with the first sentence on that page:

"Yowever, the governments of Great Britain and the United States have made various protests against our Government because they probably misunderstood that Japan was going to occupy French-Indo China by

3

4

5

2

1

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

28

24

force of arms. But it is clear, as the joint statement of Japan and France shows, that we respect the territorial integrity of French-Indo China, and have no intention of occupying that territory."

I go to the second to the last paragraph on the same page:

"It goes without saying that our country has absolutely no intention of purposely fighting with any other country, but at the same time we reject and are determined to fight to the end with any nation which tries to stand by Chiang Kai-shek, and thus protract the China Incident, and prevent East Asia from restoring to peace."

On page 9, the last paragraph:

"This Tripartite Pact is indeed a treaty effected under such circumstances and essentially defensive in its nature. Negatively the Pact aims at checking the aggravation of the world chaos which might be accelerated by the new participation of any country either in the China Incident or in the Furopean War, while, positively, it aims at establishing a new order which enables each nation in the world to live in contentment and peace, and at bringing about permanent peace on the basis of justice and impartiality through the cooperation of the three powers -- Japan, Germany

and Italy. The fact is that the lofty spirit of socalled "HAKKOICHIU" (the world as one household), in
other words, this great ideal of the "YAMATO" race
(Japanese) manifested in the Rescript of Emperor
JIMMU at the foundation of our country, has for the
first time been given shape in the modern international
treaty. It is really a sincere desire of mankind and
also a Providence, I believe, for the three peoples of
Japan, Germany, and Italy to unite firmly into one
under this great ideal and lofty spirit in the face
of the unprecedented chaotic crisis that the world has
ever had."

The last two paragraphs on page 10:

"On the other hand, I am not yet in a position
to tell you concretely what response has the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact created, or is going to
create among the powers. It is certain, however, that
the great strength of the Tripartite Pact has given
such a deep impression upon the powers that some of them
are taking strong attitude in desperation toward us,
and we should always look out for it. At the same time,
it seems that a reflective view of what made Japan,
Germany and Italy effect such a pact is gradually gaining ground. At any rate, we should always make preparations in anticipation of the worst situation.

and Italy. The fact is that the lofty spirit of socalled "HAKKOICHIU" (the world as one household), in
other words, this great ideal of the "YAMATO" race
(Japanese) manifested in the Rescript of Emperor
JIMMU at the foundation of our country, has for the
first time been given shape in the modern international
treaty. It is really a sincere desire of mankind and
also a Providence, I believe, for the three peoples of
Japan, Germany, and Italy to unite firmly into one
under this great ideal and lofty spirit in the face
of the unprecedented chaotic crisis that the world has
ever had."

The last two paragraphs on page 10:

"On the other hand, I am not yet in a position
to tell you concretely what response has the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact created, or is going to
create among the powers. It is certain, however, that
the great strength of the Tripartite Pact has given
such a deep impression upon the powers that some of them
are taking strong attitude in desperation toward us,
and we should always look out for it. At the same time,
it seems that a reflective view of what made Japan,
Germany and Italy effect such a pact is gradually gaining ground. At any rate, we should always make preparations in anticipation of the worst situation.

"In the Imperial Rescript promulgated when Japan withdrew from the League of Nations, His Majesty the Emperor specially declared: 'However, the advancement of international peace is what, as evermore, we desire, and Our attitude toward enterprises of peace shall sustain no change. By quitting the League and embarking on a course of its own, Our Empire does not mean that it will stand aloof in the extreme Orient nor that it will isolate itself thereby from the fraternity of nations. It is Our desire to promote mutual confidence between Our Empire and all the other Powers and to make known the justice of its cause throughout the world.' Furthermore, in the Imperial Rescript issued when the present alliance was concluded, His Majesty the Emperor said at the outset: 'It is a great instruction of Our Imperial Ancestors which We always observe faithfully to uphold the cause of justice and humanity throughout the world and to change the universe into one household.' In conformity with this Imperial will, we should more positively exert ourselves to improve our diplomatic relations with other nations, and to bring about true peace all over the world. However, we are living in an unprecedented turbulent age and are unable to tell what accident will further happen, when, and where. And jealousy and

3

6

7

8

10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

suspicion are commonly associated with the age of wars. For example, when we declare that we intend to establish the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, some states are apt to doubt if Japan, monopolizing the Greater Fast Asia including the South Seas, is going to shut out other powers from the area and to deny their rightful actions therein. This is not true. The object thereof is to do away with all the improper conducts and measures which the western powers have hitherto practised as well as all the unnatural restrictions imposed by them upon the rightful actions of human beings in the field of their economic activities such as commerce, enterprise, communications, traffic and the like in the Greater Fast Asia Co-prosperity Sphere. And our country also wishes to act on the same equal basis with the other powers, in order to promote the prosperity and stabilization of all the races in the Greater East Asia Sphere, so that they may walk along the path of mutual tolerance and welfare with the prerequisite condition of freedom to cut and decide their own respective way to Fortune.

"In short, Japan, unlike the practice hitherto committed by the western powers, neither intends to swallow up any territories nor conquer, nor exploit any people in this sphere. On the contrary, Japan wants

2

4

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

25 24

to free the natives from the imperialistic oppressions, to love them as brothers and sisters instead of treating them as slaves, and to establish a relation of mutual existence and prosperity."

"The relations between our country and the Soviet Union, heretofore, have not been friendly for various reasons, but I believe that at this critical moment which might be called the time of a world revolution, both countries should not quarrel with each other at the corner of Fast Asia. I believe that the time has now come when, if there is any misunderstanding or if there are any pending problems between the two countries, we should now try to remove or settle them and should cooperate for a greater mission. In the Soviet Union they are repeatedly saying that they won't pick up chestnuts in the fire for any other state. This to the same with every nation."

I proceed to page 14, the middle of the page:

"The last point I should like to touch upon
on this pact is the fact that although it has been
effected, it does not necessarily mean that Japan will
take part in the European War, or will immediately
make an enemy of any power other than Germany and Italy.
So long as the powers which have not yet participated

attack any of the three Countries--Japan, Germany and Italy, nor disturb our plan of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere, our country is willing to be in friendly terms with them and to share in the godsend benefits. It goes without saying that we have no intention of breeding unnecessary troubles with them. Therefore we should strictly refrain from raising any rash anti-foreign agitation without any justifiable reasons.

"By the way, as there are instances in which a trivial matter resulting in a grave consequence or effect, I should like to add a few more words in this connection. I dare say it is not infrequent that the attitude of our policemen in charge of foreign nationals is apt to be unnecessarily irritating toward them.

To be frank with you, this state of affair has so far turned out to be unfavorable to our country in dealing with international problems.

it may be more difficult, I am sure, to deal with this affair than in normal times, but for the very reason that this is an emergency, I hope you will be all the more prudent about this matter. I should like to ask you to stop, as far as possible, any interference or supervision which is apparently not in line with our

common sense. At the same time, I should like to ask you to instruct our people to be magnanimous worthy of a great nation in advancing toward our great aim. I believe that the pact which has been concluded this time shows this direction very clearly. I am now feeling that the dark clouds and fog that had long been hanging low before us since the outbreak of the China Incident have now been swept away, and we can now see a bright future full of hope, though the way to it may be very difficult and steep. I earnestly hope and am counting on you that you officials will make our people understand well what I have said today and at this critical moment when the destiny of the "YAMATO" race, (Japanese) nay, of the entire human beings of the world may be determined, you will render your service to our country together with our whole 100,000,000 people united as one body."

18

17

19

20

21 22

23

24

Morse & Lefter

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Court please, the fourth document of the series, defense document 1072, is offered in evidence. This is Premier KONOYE's address in the 76th session of the Diet on the 21st of January, 1941, which explains the peaceful purposes of the Pact as the period of time went on. I might suggest that the prosecution has intimated in their proof that the Pact was improperly implemented as time went on and this is one of the documents which shows that the peaceful purposes of the Pact were maintained.

THE PRESIDENT: Bridgedier Nolen.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, we object to the document. The only reference I can find in it to the Tri-Partite Pact is to be found on page 2 where it says quite briefly that "The purport of the recently concluded Japan-German-Italian Tripartite Treaty was clarified in the Imperial Rescript issued at that time." The rest of the document consists of a threat to destroy those who resist Japan and a call for resolution to establish a new order in Greater East Asia. It deals with education and the productive power of the nation and a low price policy law.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't suprose you object as far as regards that sentence you read and the following

sentence.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: No, I don't object to it, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: In exhibit 1300 the prosecution used a speech on the Pact as late as January, 1941 -- MATSUOKA's. A colleague reminds me of that, and it is relevant, too.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: But of course, your Honor, we submit that there is a vast difference between the purposes for which we may need evidence for a prosecution and the nature of an evidence which may be admitted by the defense in exculpation of the charges against them.

THE PRESIDENT: You tender part of the reasons of those who know; they tender the balance. Why shouldn't they?

BRIGADIER NOLAN: We tender them to show that a speech was made at that time by an individual who made certain remarks. The defense produced these documents, as I understand it, for the purpose of establishing as a fact those matters which are referred to in the speeches themselves.

But the Tribunal has ruled in respect of the last document that it desires to hear what was said in respect of the reasons for entering into this Pact.

In view of that ruling, I cannot and do not object to the references to the Pact contained in this document of which I can only find one.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is all I care to read, your Honor. I only want to show that he said the same thing one time that he said another time. And I only want to go from "Our country" on page 1 to "vigorous efforts" on page 2.

THE PRESIDENT: No, the only two that Brigadier Nolan doesn't object to -- the only two sentences are those that I referred to. They are the first two sentences in the third paragraph on page 2.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I can't find that, but all I want to do is to read those three paragraphs or so from "Our country" down to "vigorous efforts", and they concern the Tri-Partite Pact. Or I might go on page 2 from "The purport of the recently concluded" Pact down to "vigorous efforts" at the end of that paragraph.

THE PRESIDENT: Only the first two sentences relate to the Pact as far as I can judge.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I will cut it down to the first two sentences of that paragraph.

THE PRESIDENT: The document is admitted to that extent on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1072 will receive exhibit No. 2741.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2741 and received in evidence.)

7 8

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I read from exhibit 2741, page 2, middle of the page:

"The purport of the recently concluded Japan-German-Italian Tri-Partite Treaty was clarified in the Imperial Rescript issued at that time. With the conclusion of this treaty, Japan aims to maintain world peace and advance towards the high aim of stabilization of Greater East Asia. Needless to say --"

THE PRESIDENT: That is enough. That is all that is admitted.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: "We do not want any more war --"

THE PRESIDENT: The reporter will not report any more.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I suggest that that last sentence be stricken from the record, eliminated from the part allowed. I am sorry about that.

THE PRESIDENT: I anticipated you, Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: For the same purpose, I call the Court's attention to prosecution exhibit 558, transcript pages 6412 to 6417, the broadcast of ITO, Nobumi on the 26th of September, 1941, showing the peaceful nature of the Tri-Partite Pact, referring particularly to the bottom of page 2 and the first

paragraph on page 2.

I now offer in evidence defense document No. 312, address of Foreign Minister TOYODA on the first anniversary of the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact, to show that despite the change of Japanese Cabinet Foreign Minister TOYODA considered the Pact as the basis of Japanese diplomacy in the understanding that the mission of the Pact was to establish peace and to prevent the extension of the hostilities and dispute.

THE PRESIDENT: Brigadier Nolan.

BRIGADIER NOLAN: May it please the Tribunal, this speech makes three points. The first one is that Hungary and Rumania have joined the pact. That has already been proved in this case.

The second point raised is that difficulties will arise from time to time and must be met. That is mere conjecture.

The third point that the speaker made was that the pact has prevented the spread of hostilities. That is a matter of opinion.

We submit that this document is of no assistance to the Tribunal and should be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear you after the recess, Mr. Cunningham.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

1

3

4 5

6

7 9

9

10

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-ings were resumed as follows:) deligned or chavenging two extension of the pispate As

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International 1 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham. 3 IR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, 4 all that I am interested in in this document 312 is 5 D page 2, the first four lines of the paragraph. 6 d THE PRESILENT: He was the Foreign Minister 7 8 of the day? MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir. 9 10 THE PRESIDENT: And this speech was made on 11 the day -- a year later, was it? 12 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Anniversary, yes, sir. 13 THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection 14 is overruled and the document admitted to the extent of 15 those four lines referred to by Mr. Cunningham. 16 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 312 17 will receive exhibit No. 2742. 18 (Whereupon, the document above 19 referred to was marked defense exhibit 20 No. 2742 and received in evidence.) 21 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I read on page 2 of 22 exhibit 2742, the address of Foreign Minister TOYODA. 23

"Thirdly, the Three-Power Pact has a lofty

mission of preventing the extension of the dispute as

well as the spread of hostilities as far as possible.

2

24

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International W h Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham. 3 MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, 4 all that I am interested in in this document 312 is 5 page 2, the first four lines of the paragraph. 6 d THE PRESILENT: He was the Foreign Minister 7 of the day? 8 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir. 9 THE PRESIDENT: And this speech was made on 10 the day -- a year later, was it? 11 MR. CUNNINGHAM: Anniversary, yes, sir. 12 THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection 13 is overruled and the document admitted to the extent of 14 those four lines referred to by Mr. Cunningham. 15 16 CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 312 17 will receive exhibit No. 2742. 18 (Whereupon, the document above 19 referred to was marked defense exhibit 20 No. 2742 and received in evidence.) 21 MR. CUNNINGHAM: I read on page 2 of 22 exhibit 2742, the address of Foreign Minister TOYODA. 23 "Thirdly, the Three-Power Pact has a lofty 24 mission of preventing the extension of the dispute as 25 well as the spread of hostilities as far as possible.

I have no doubt that in the past year the pact has also accomplished a great deal in this respect."

THE PRESIDENT: Have you any more documents of this nature?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Just one more, as I understand.

I now offer in evidence defense document

311, the address of Foreign Minister TOGO on the
extraordinary session of the Diet of the 17th of November, 1941, and read only the part of it which
concerns the Tri-Partite Pact, to show that Foreign
Minister TOGO, as the second foreign minister after
MATSUOKA, also respected and considered the TriPartite Pact as the instrument of peace.

I only want to read pages 1 and 2 which concern the Tri-Partite Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 311

will receive exhibit No. 2743.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2743 and received in evidence.)

TOGO, delivered at the extraordinary session of the

Diet, November 17, 1941.

"With the heavy responsibilities for the conduct of foreign affairs having unexpectedly devolved upon me--"

THE PRESIDENT: We haven't our copies yet.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Oh, I am sorry.

THE PRESIDENT: But you are reading only part of this, aren't you?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, sir.

Starting again:

THE PRESIDENT: That is the only part admitted.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The first two pages, down
to "...spread of the war," the middle of page 2.

"With the heavy responsibilities for the conduct of foreign affairs having unexpectedly devolved upon me it is a great pleasure for me to avail myself of this opportunity today of speaking on the foreign policy of the Imperial Government.

"Japan, engaged for the past four years in military operations for the construction of a new order in East Asia, is now marching forward to surmount current difficulties with the unity of the entire nation. First of all, I wish good fortune and success to the officers and men of our gallant fighting services who are distinguishing themselves on the front

1 2

.

. 19

under the August Virtue of His Imperial Majesty, paying, at the same time, my humble and sincere tribute to the honoured spirits of many who have fallen.

"It needs no reiteration that the fundamental principle of Japan's foreign policy aims at the establishment of peace in East Asia based on justice, thereby contributing toward the promotion of general welfare of mankind. It is nothing other than the fruit of the constant efforts exerted in espousal of this great principle that our country has witnessed an unceasing development of her national fortune since the Meiji Restoration. It may be recalled that in the past seventy and odd years Japan has, on more than one occasion, successfully overcome national crises. Especially noteworthy is the Russo-Japanese War, in which Japan staked her national existence in order to eliminate an obstacle to the peace of East Asia. She has since been advancing her position as the stabilizing force in East Asia, and is now endeavouring with unflinching courage to accomplish the great task of inaugurating toward the peace of the world.

"Fortunately, Germany and Italy having similar views with Japan, the Three-Power Pact was brought into being. In a little more than a year of its existence, as is well known, the pact has made, as

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

24

25

intended, a great contribution toward the construction of new order in East Asia and Europe, as well as to-

The following third group of witnesses and documents will show that the notives of the Japanese Government in concluding the Tri-Partite Pact on 27 September 1940 and the purpose of that pact as interpreted by the Japanese Government were peaceful and purely defensive, and Germany also assured Japan of her peaceful intention during the negotiations for the pact. It will further be shown that the Tri-Partite Pact is entirely different from the abortive treaty negotiated in 1938 and 1939 by the HIRANUMA Cabinet.

I first call -- skipping down to the middle of the page of the introduction -- I first call Witness Heinrich Stahmer, former ambassador of Germany to Japan, who could be considered as one of the best living authorities on Japanese-German relations.

THE PRESIDENT: It is not within the province of counsel to give certificates of quality to witnesses. After hearing this witness, we will tell you what we think of him if necessary. He may or may not prove to be what you say. You do not know yet, nor do we.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I want to refer again to the fact that the rule of the Tribunal has not been complied with with regard to service of the affidavit of this witness within the prescribed time.

THE PRESIDENT: Has there been a substantial compliance?

MR. TAVENNER: The affidavit was served at five minutes until 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon -- five minutes before 5. Notwithstanding the fact that it has been stated that this affidavit was prepared about five days ago, it had not been served upon us until as late as it seemed that it could be possible to serve it.

I made an investigation of the situation described yesterday and I find that the document was not tendered to the prosecution section, and I find that both from our own representatives in that section as well as from those whose duty it was to deliver it there.

THE PRESIDENT: If the delivery was a little late perhaps it was due to temporary disorganization, and without committing yourself to the future you might overlook it, Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: We overlooked it, of course, on many occasions.

THE PRESIDENT: We are trying to save time.

We have had the affidavit for three days, of course. I mentioned yesterday the rule was complied with with regard to the Judges.

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir. But, unfortunately, that does not help us.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, are you insisting on your objection? If you do, we sustain it.

MR. TAVENNER: The suggestion has been made that we have only the direct examination today. If that is true, I don't object to that, of course.

THE PRESIDENT: It will take until 4 o'clock to read this. We won't take any cross-examination today, or permit any further questioning.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, I am just as sorry as I can be that these documents didn't get out. It required a lot of wear and tear on my disposition to get them delivered yesterday afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I understand my colleagues want a fuller explanation.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I went to the document section yesterday afternoon to determine why the document had not been delivered when the American copies were

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

24

1 2 3

completed three or four or five days ago. They told me that they were not permitted to deliver the English copy until the Japanese copy was ready, and that they would not do it. With a little persuasion I was able to convince them that that rule should be waived in regard to this affidavit, and the English copies were delivered to the prosecution yesterday.

It was just due to a slight delay in the translation from English to Japanese, as I understand it.

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed.

25

HEIN	RICH STAHMER, called as a witness
on	behalf of the defense, being first duly
sw	orn, testified as follows:
	DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR.	CUNNINGHAM:
Q	Will you state your full name and present
address	, please?
A	My name is Heinrich Stahmer. I am living in
Atami,	Mampei Hotel.
Q	Now, I will ask the marshal to hand you
defense	document 1675 and ask you to state if that is
your af	fidavit.
A	Yes, that is my affidavit.
Q	I will ask you to state if the contents thereo:
are true	and correct as you verily believe?
	MR. CUNNINGHAM: I offer in evidence defense
document	: 1675, the affidavit of
	THE PRESIDENT: He didn't enswer.
	MR. CUNNINGHAM: (Continuing) Heinrich
Stahmer.	
	THE PRESIDENT: I didn't hear him answer if the
affidavi	t was true.
Q	I ask you to state if this affidavit is true.
A	Yes, sir, it is true.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, I desire to object to the introduction of large portions of this affidavit.

I object to the entire section marked with the Roman numeral I in that it is irrelevant and immaterial.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you can't mean all that.

You see the heading is misleading. Under the "Background" he includes his name and the form of oath and
his address.

MR. TAVENNER: And, of course, that is also true as to his former position.

THE PRESIDENT: However, we understand what you mean.

MR TAVENNER: Yes. I should have confined my objection to the last three paragraphs on the first page and to the three paragraphs on the top of page 2.

Objection is also made to the last two paragraphs on page 2. What it was usual to do in regard to employment of liaison persons is certainly not proper evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you object to the whole of Section 2?

MR. TAVENNER: I do not object to the first paragraph in that that relates to the relationships

2

1

4

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

19

19

21

22

23 24

between Ribbentrop and OSHIMA.

I do object, however, to the last paragraph under that Section 2 which appears at the top of page 3.

Under Article 3 on page 3 I object to the second paragraph in which the affiant endeavors to state what the negotiating powers had in mind in 1938 and 1939, on the ground that such statements are an invasion of the province of the Tribunal.

Objection is also made to the following paragraph as being irrelevant and immaterial.

The next paragraph, beginning with the words
"The negotiations progressed" and so forth, is objected
to in that it refers to a rough draft of an agreement
which the affiant attempts to describe, and which is
not produced or the absence of which is not accounted
for.

Objection is also made to the latter part of the following paragraph, which is the last paragraph on page 3, beginning with the sentence "A deadlock developed over the interpretation of Article III . . ." This is evidently the same agreement referred to in the preceding paragraph and which has not been produced.

GREENBERG&REICHERS

On page 4, in the middle of the second paragraph we find a sentence which says: "In May 1939 the Japanese Prime Minister HARANUMA," and so forth. The document describing that message is in evidence and has been read in its entirety, and we consider it is improper for the witness to attempt to describe to the following paragraph deals with the same

subject matter and is objected to for the same reason.

The next paragraph, which is the second from
the bottom of page 4, refers to the duty of an ambassalor, "enerally, and is objected to as being irrelevant

and immaterial.

At the very bottom of page 4, beginning at

the middle of the sentence, "However, when Ambassador

ott asked for information," and so forth, it has reference to a telegram which is not produced in evidence

and the absence of which is not accounted for, and

rerefore objection is made.

On page 5, reference is made to the third

paragraph from the top of the page. That matter is

covered by numerous documents introduced in evidence

and therefore is objectionable on the ground that it

repetitive.

The next paragraph, which ollows, which is

the last paragraph under 4, is objectionable as expressing the "itness's opinion and conclusions. I will skip now to page 10, the last paragraph on that page. Objection is made to the second sentence in that paragraph, "there was no joint German-Japanese war," and so forth, for the reason that it is a conclusion and that the Tribunal must determine s what constitutes joint warfare. On page 11 reference is made to the last sentence in paragraph one, beginning "the claim that the 11 three nations," and so forth, which is likewise object-12 ed to on the ground that it is an invasion of the pro-13 vince of the Tribunal, and it is an expression of 14 opinion or conclusion on the part of the witness. 15 16 17 18 19 20

28

21

22

The next succeeding four paragraphs are, likewise, objected to. They refer to Germany's regard toward the United States, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Republic of France and the Netherlands which are the result of conclusions and opinions on the part of the witness and the subject matter of which is irrelevant to any issue we are trying here.

No objection is made to the last maragraph on that page.

Now, on the last and 12th page, objection is made to the entire material on that page for the same reasons and on the same grounds as asserted as to the four paragraphs on the preceding page. Germany's interest in Siam, the Philippines and other places mentioned can have no bearing upon the issues in this trial.

This constitutes the objection. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

your Honor, as to the background and qualifications of the witness, I believe that you will find, after the questions have been propounded to the witness by the other defense counsel who have questions and after the additional document, 1714, containing

questions, that each element in his background gives this witness a basis upon which to answer the specific questions, and I believe it is all essential. I cannot help but believe that the qualifications of this witness should be a little more extensive than the average witness. This man was sent out as the representative of his country to make an international agreement. I am perfectly willing to scratch out of that background material anything which you think you do not wish to know.

On the second objection, due to the number of documents which were introduced concerning Japanese-German relations, I think it essential to show the relationship between this witness and the ambassadors from Japan to Germany and the relationship of this witness to the foreign minister of Germany, von Libbentrop. And, to rebut any suggestion of conspiracy between the two nations or representatives, I merely wanted to show that liaison between the foreign minister and the ambassadors was something that was maintained between the ambassadors of various countries and the foreign minister of Germany. Due to the fact that this witness may be the only foreign ambassador to be called as a witness in this case, I thought, perhaps, the informa-

,

tion in these paragraphs would be helpful to the Tribunal.

In referring to the middle of page 3, the proposed treaty the negotiating powers had in mind, I suggest that how are we going to know what the contracting parties had in mind besides their agreements unless we call upon witnesses to tell

Now, on the negotiations, that progressed, at first, smoothly, and the rough draft, I call your attention to the fact that the rough draft is in evidence and need not be accounted for, as I understand it.

Now, an objection has been made as to the sentence, "a deadlock developed over the interpretation of Article 3." The witness, in answer to the question "What caused the rupture in the negotiations?" -- his natural answer would be, "A deadlock occurred as a result of the interpretation of Article 3." I don't see anything that could be more explicit.

On page 4, the second paragraph, we have 25 the Japanese interpretation of the reasons why certain things happened. This is merely the German interpretation of it from one of the men who was

9

us?

10

11 12

13 14

16

18

21

taking part in the negotiations.

On the next paragraph, although it is the duty of an ambassador, one of the questions in this case is, to what extent an ambassador should be held for the policy of his government, and this paragraph throws a little light upon that.

Now, on the bottom of page 4 it is suggested, when Ambassador Ott asked for information concerning this matter, that ties in with that former paragraph and it supports the evidence which is already in the record, but it gives the point of view from the other side.

On the objection to the third paragraph in page 5, I say that this gives the German view, and we have not had very much on that side of the question, and I think it would be relevant.

On the fourth paragraph on page 5, I believe the Ballantine testimony and the other information hinged more or less upon the statement of the policy of his government, and I think this man is qualified to testify as to what the policy of his government was on certain questions.

Then going to page 10, there is an objection that there was no joint German and Japanese war. In fact, there were two wars. This will be sub-

3 4

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

15 16

17

18

20

21 22

23

stantiated in statements by the greatest living authorities on the subject, not as witnesses, but as statements of these witnesses in the best form that we can present them, and they will be corroborated with other documents.

As far as page 11 and 12 are concerned, on the conclusions, it was the thought of the witness, in preparation of the affidavit, that these items were items which went into the considerations -- the attitude shown in the conclusions is a factor which went into the consideration of this witness and his superiors in bringing about the international agreement between Japan, Germany and Italy; and these last two pages are responses to two questions:

No. 1: The charge has been made that Japan and Germany and Italy set out to dominate the world. What was the attitude of the Germany Government to-ward that question?

No. 2: What was the attitude of the German Government toward the various countries of the world and those specifically mentioned?

These are the answers in the last two pages.

Now, it is a question for the Tribunal,
after listening to this witness, to determine

whether or not he is qualified to give the answer

to those questions.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Tribunal upholds the objections and rejects the document to the extent of the objections. Otherwise, the document is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1675 will receive exhibit No. 2744.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2744 and received in evidence.)

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honors, I have a second affidavit in the form of questions and answers which the witness has sworn to that I would like to offer at the same time in order that there be no interruption in the reading.

THE PRESIDENT: We will not take that this afternoon. We have a conference now. In the meantime, revise the affidavit in the terms of the objections which have been sustained and present the amended copy.

We will adjourn until half-past nine Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 1555, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 16 June 1947, at 0930.)

6

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23 24